

1 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP

2 Claude M. Stern (Bar No. 96737)

3 claudestern@quinnemanuel.com

4 Evette Pennypacker (Bar No. 203515)

5 evettepennypacker@quinnemanuel.com

6 Thomas R. Watson (Bar No. 227264)

7 tomwatson@quinnemanuel.com

8 555 Twin Dolphin Dr., 5th floor

9 Redwood Shores, CA 94065

Telephone: (650) 801-5000

Facsimile: (650) 801-5100

7 Joshua L. Sohn (Bar No. 250105)

50 California Street, 22nd Floor

8 San Francisco, CA 94111

9 Telephone: (415) 875-6600

Facsimile: (415) 875-6700

10 Attorneys for Defendant Fusion Garage PTE Ltd.

11 WINSTON & STRAWN LLP

12 Andrew P. Bridges (Bar No.: 122761)

13 Abridges@winston.com

14 David S. Bloch (SBN: 184530)

Dbloch@winston.com

15 Matthew A. Scherb (Bar No. 237461)

16 mscherb@winston.com

17 WINSTON & STRAWN LLP

18 101 California Street, 39th Floor

19 San Francisco, CA 94111-5802

20 Telephone: (415) 591-1000

21 Facsimile: (415) 591-1400

22 Attorneys for Plaintiffs Inserserve, Inc., et al.

23
24 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
25 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
26 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

27 INTERSERVE, INC. dba TECHCRUNCH, a
28 Delaware corporation, and CRUNCHPAD,
INC., a Delaware corporation,

29 Plaintiffs,

30 vs.

31 FUSION GARAGE PTE. LTD, a Singapore
32 company,

33 Defendant.

34 CASE NO. 09-cv-5812 RS (PVT)

35 STIPULATION AND [XXXXXXXXXXXX]
36 ORDER GRANTING EXTENSION OF
37 TIME REGARDING BRIEFING ON
38 PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO COMPEL

1 WHEREAS, on September 7, 2010, Plaintiffs filed a Motion to Compel Production of
 2 Withheld Information and Documents (Dkt. 164) (“Motion”);

3 WHEREAS, Fusion Garage’s Opposition to the Motion is currently due September 21,
 4 2010, Plaintiffs’ Reply is due September 28, 2010, and the Motion hearing is set for October 12,
 5 2010;

6 WHEREAS, the Fusion Garage attorney with primary responsibility for Fusion Garage’s
 7 Opposition has been ill for the past several days and has been unable to effectively respond to
 8 Plaintiffs’ motion during this time;

9 WHEREAS, due to this illness, Fusion Garage has sought Plaintiffs’ stipulation to a two-
 10 day extension for Fusion Garage’s Opposition to the Motion;

11 WHEREAS, Plaintiffs agree to this stipulation, on the condition that Fusion Garage
 12 stipulate to a corresponding two-day extension for Plaintiffs’ Reply to the Motion and that the
 13 hearing currently set for October 12, 2010 remains on calendar;

14 WHEREAS, the following time modifications have been previously made in this case:
 15 time to file a responsive pleading (Dkt. No. 16); motion to set the hearing dates on Fusion
 16 Garage’s motion to dismiss, to strike, and for a more definite statement (“motion to dismiss”) and
 17 Plaintiffs’ motion for a preliminary injunction to May, 6, 2010 (Dkt. No. 45); motion to shorten
 18 time to hear Fusion Garage’s motion to compel documents to support its opposition to Plaintiffs’
 19 Motion for a preliminary injunction (Dkt. No. 55); and setting new hearing date on Plaintiffs’
 20 motion for a preliminary injunction and defendant’s motion to dismiss (Dkt. 64).

21 WHEREAS, the brief extensions sought by this stipulation will not impact the currently-
 22 scheduled hearing date for the Motion;

23 NOW, THEREFORE, the parties stipulate that Fusion Garage shall have a two-day
 24 extension, until September 23, 2010, to file its Opposition to the Motion. The parties further
 25 stipulate that Plaintiffs shall have a corresponding two-day extension, until September 30, 2010, to
 26 file their Reply to the Motion. The hearing on Plaintiffs’ Motion—October 12, 2010—will remain
 27
 28

1 unchanged.

2 IT IS SO STIPULATED.

3 Dated: September 21, 2010

4 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
5 SULLIVAN, LLP

6 By /s/

7 Thomas R. Watson

8
9
10 Attorneys for Defendant Fusion Garage PTE., Ltd.

DATED: September 21, 2010

WINSTON & STRAWN LLP

11 By /s/

12 Matthew A. Scherb

13
14 Attorneys for Plaintiffs TechCrunch, Inc. and
15 CrunchPad, Inc.

16 Pursuant to stipulation, it is SO ORDERED.

17 DATED: September 22, 2010

18
19
20 
21 HON. PATRICIA V. TRUMBULL
22 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

FILER'S ATTESTATION

Pursuant to General Order No. 45, Section X(B) regarding signatures, I attest that I have obtained concurrence in the filing of this document from Matthew A. Sherb, counsel for Plaintiffs.

DATED: September 21, 2010

By: /s/ Thomas R. Watson
Thomas R. Watson